



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,851	12/27/2001	John Wesley Moss	8285-459	9642

7590 01/25/2005

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

ANWAH, OLISA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2645

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/034,851

Applicant(s)

MOSS ET AL.

Examiner

Olisa Anwah

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-5 and 10-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 18 and 19 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections.- 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this

Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 6, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wurster et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,459,780 (hereinafter Wurster) in view of Mitchell, U.S. Patent No. 5,651,053 (hereinafter Mitchell).

Regarding claim 6, Wurster discloses a service node (see Figure 1) operable in a telecommunications system for implementing a call control service for managing call delivery to a subscriber to the call control service, the service node comprising:

first computer code to detect caller identification information for a call from a calling communication station to a called communication station (117) routed to the service node, the call defined in part by a directory number associated with

Art Unit: 2645

the calling communication station (col. 5, line 40) and a directory number associated with the called communication station (col. 7, line 24);

second computer code to provide a caller identifier based on the detected caller identification information for a new call placed from the service node to the called communication station (see Figure 3A), the second computer code being further configured to produce a setup message for the new call, the setup message including;

- a calling party identification field set to the calling party directory number (col. 7, lines 25-35);

- a called party identification field set to the directory number associated with the called communication station (col. 7, lines 20-25), and

- a redirecting element field set to a predetermined directory number associated with the call control service;

and third computer code to detect a call disposition option entered as a single key press by a called party at the called communication station (see Figure 3B).

Wurster teaches the claimed redirecting element field because all SS7 messages use a redirecting number. The

Art Unit: 2645

redirecting number identifies the number that forwarded the call. Since switch 102 forwards the call to the called CCS party, the redirecting element field is set to the directory number of switch 102. Note the number of switch 102 is a number that is associated with the call screening service. Hence Wurster discloses the claimed redirecting element field.

Wurster fails to disclose fourth computer code responsive to detection of the call disposition option to add the directory number associated with the calling party determined from the detected caller identification information to a blocking list associated with the called communication station. However Mitchell discloses this limitation (see abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wurster with the computer code taught by Mitchell. This modification would have improved the efficiency of Wurster by automatically blocking calls from disfavored callers as suggested by Mitchell.

Regarding claim 8, see col. 7, lines 15-35 of Wurster.

Regarding claim 9, see Figure 3B of Wurster.

Art Unit: 2645

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wurster combined with Mitchell in view of Frech et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,729,592 (hereinafter Frech).

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Wurster and Mitchell teaches playing signals representative of audible speech to the called communication station. This combination does not disclose computer code to translate text of the detected caller identification information to signals representative of audible speech. However Frech discloses this limitation (see column 2). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell with the translator taught by Frech. This modification would have made the systems of Wurster and Mitchell more reliable by retrieving the caller's name from a database.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Art Unit: 2645

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claim 18 is allowed because Wurster fails to disclose determining if a redirecting element field is set to a specified directory number.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa Anwah whose telephone number is 703-305-4814. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 703-305-4895. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

O.A.

Olisa Anwah
Patent Examiner
October 28, 2004


FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600